4.   The method of claim 1, further comprising a step of:

during the step of moving all reads, passing all reads made to the logical entity at the first storage element to the copy on the second storage element.

7.   The method of claim 6, further comprising a step of determining an enterprise logical volume identifier (ELVID) for the logical volume.

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed March 14, 2003, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. To further the prosecution of this application, the claims have been amended, and the Applicant submits the following remarks.

Claim Objections

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, claim 7 is objected to for allegedly failing to define the acronym "ELVID." The Applicant has amended claim 7 to define the acronym as it is defined in the specification at p.30, line 2, as an enterprise logical volume identifier. As amended, claim 7 should be in allowable condition.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

In paragraphs 2-20, claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over the Applicants Admission of Prior Art (hereinafter "alleged AAPA") in view of United States Patent No. 6,216,211 to McBrearty et al. (hereinafter "McBrearty"). This rejection is respectfully traversed, as discussed below.

1.   **The Office Action fails to set forth a prima facie case of obviousness, as the asserted combination includes the Applicant's own disclosure of the present invention, and is thus not prior art.**

The Office Action asserts that claims 1-30 are obvious over the alleged AAPA in view of McBrearty. In particular, the Office Action alleges that the Applicant discusses a prior art system at p. 39, lines 9-19 of the specification, when referring to Figure 19. In this passage, a

705807.1